

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | No. CV-F-05-290 REC/DLB |
| |) | |
| |) | ORDER STRIKING "NOTICE THAT |
| Petitioner, |) | THE ORDER/OFFER OF ROBERT E. |
| |) | COYLE, DATED OCTOBER 13, |
| vs. |) | 2005; (DOC 71) HAS BEEN |
| |) | REFUSED FOR FRAUD, WITHOUT |
| |) | DISHONOR AND THE AUTHORIZED |
| V. STEVEN BOOTH and LOUISE |) | AGENT FOR VINCENT STEVEN |
| Q. BOOTH, |) | BOOTH ACCEPTS THE |
| |) | ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF |
| |) | ACCEPTANCE/COUNTER OFFER OF |
| |) | ALL CLAIMS, (DOC 70)." (Doc. |
| |) | 72) |
| Respondent. |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |

On October 19, 2005, respondent V. Steven Booth filed a "NOTICE THAT THE ORDER/OFFER OF ROBERT E. COYLE, DATED OCTOBER 13, 2005; (DOC 71) HAS BEEN REFUSED FOR FRAUD, WITHOUT DISHONOR AND THE AUTHORIZED AGENT FOR VINCENT STEVEN BOOTH ACCEPTS THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ACCEPTANCE/COUNTER OFFER OF ALL CLAIMS, (DOC 70)." In this pleading, respondent asserts that he, as the "authorized agent" for himself, "accepts the court's order dated

1 October 13, 2005 ... as acceptance of the terms of the Notice of
2 Acceptance dated October 12, 2005. (Doc 70)." In addition,
3 respondent asserts that he "has been informed that the order
4 dated October 13, 2005 ... may constitute the practice of law
5 from the bench, is legally invalid, without merit or effect,
6 scandalous, an abuse of discretion, an abuse of authority,
7 constitutes a trespass and may constitutes [sic] an abuse of
8 process."

9 The court hereby strikes this document and disregards it for
10 all further proceedings in this action. As stated in the court's
11 Order filed on October 14, 2005 striking respondent's document
12 docketed as document no. 70, the undersigned, Robert E. Coyle, is
13 not and never has been a surety for either of the respondents
14 with regard to any claims made against them by the Internal
15 Revenue Service or for any other claims against them made by any
16 other person or entity. Therefore, the October 14, 2005 Order is
17 not an "acceptance of the terms of the Notice of Acceptance dated
18 October 12, 2005. (Doc 70)." The undersigned, Robert E. Coyle,
19 has no financial obligation or responsibility to respondent for
20 any claims made against him by any person or entity. Again, the
21 court concludes that the instant document is legally invalid,
22 without merit or effect, and constitutes an abuse of process.
23 The court advises petitioner that the court has the inherent
24 power to sanction a litigant appearing before it for abuse of
25 process by the continued filing of frivolous pleadings, which can
26 include the payment of a monetary sanction, contempt, or

1 restrictions on the filing of pleadings. If respondent persists
2 in filing any more documents asserting or implying that the
3 undersigned, Robert E. Coyle, stands as a surety for the claims
4 against respondents by the Internal Revenue Service, the court
5 will issue an order to show cause why respondent should not be
6 sanctioned under the court's inherent power.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 **Dated: October 21, 2005**
668554

/s/ Robert E. Coyle
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE